

VZCZCXRO9141  
RR RUEHFL RUEHKW RUEHLA RUEHROV RUEHSR  
DE RUEHCH #0107/01 0351615  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
R 041615Z FEB 08  
FM AMEMBASSY CHISINAU  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 6224  
INFO RUEHZL/EUROPEAN POLITICAL COLLECTIVE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 CHISINAU 000107

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR EUR/UMB, L/T, EUR DAS - DKRAMER

E.O. 12958: DECL: 02/04/2018

TAGS: [PREL](#) [PBTS](#) [MARR](#) [MD](#) [RU](#)

SUBJECT: MOLDOVANS, RUSSIANS AGREE TO NEUTRALITY LANGUAGE AS BASIS  
FOR TRANSNISTRIA SETTLEMENT

Classified By: Charge Kelly Keiderling for reasons 1.4(b) and (d)

11. (U) This is an action message. See para. 8.

12. (C) Summary: In a state of "cautious optimism" about his consultations in Moscow, Presidential Advisor Marc Tkaciuk described the outlines of a three-paragraph agreement on neutrality that Moldovan officials reached with their Russian counterparts and that could serve as the basis for a settlement to the Transnistrian conflict. Tkaciuk requested a USG reaction to the document as quickly as possible. Should draft language in this document be acceptable to the U.S. (and presumably the EU and Ukraine), Tkaciuk said the following step would be to incorporate the language into a general document to which the 5+2 could agree. End Summary

Agreement on Neutrality, Little Discussion of Russian Forces  
-----

13. (SBU) On February 4 Presidential Advisor Marc Tkaciuk met with Charge d'Affaires and Pol/Econ Chief to inform the USG about his January 31-February 1 consultations in Moscow, which followed discussions by Presidents Voronin and Putin the previous week. According to press reports, in addition to Tkaciuk, the Moldovan delegation included Minister for Reintegration Vasile Sova and the head of the MFA Treaty Department, Dumitru Socolan. Media report that Tkaciuk and Sova's Russian interlocutors were Yuriy Zubakov, Valeriy Kenyakin, Valeriy Nesteruskin and Nikolay Fomin.

14. (C) Tkaciuk described the two rounds of discussions as difficult, especially the debate about Moldova's neutrality. The Russians wanted international guarantees of Moldova's neutrality, arguing that Moldova's constitutional guarantees were insufficient. The Moldovan officials argued that the international community would not guarantee a sovereign state's neutrality; little precedent existed for such guarantees. Responding to the Russians' concerns about Moldovan union with Romania, Tkaciuk pointed out that the autonomous Moldovan region of Gagauzia already has guarantees that it can secede from Moldova, if Moldova becomes part of another state. After much negotiation, the two sides agreed to the formulation in para. 13.

15. (C) Tkaciuk said that the two sides had not discussed at length the issue of Russian forces and ammunition stockpiles in Transnistria. He said his Russian interlocutors promised the Russian peacekeeping troops and ammunition would be removed "immediately after the settlement." Tkaciuk noted that such language was vague and told us he asked the Russians for a more precise definition of "immediately." The Russians responded inconclusively that they didn't want their forces to remain in Transnistria. Tkaciuk stressed that a final resolution to withdrawal of Russian peacekeepers and ammunition would have to be addressed in a holistic fashion as part of an overall settlement.

Next Steps, Request for U.S. Support  
-----

¶16. (C) If the U.S. (and presumably the EU and Ukraine) agreed to the language about neutrality, Tkaciuk said the next step would be to incorporate that language into a general document the 5+2 could accept. The Russians asked that a general 5+2 agreement be based on the unsigned 2004 Pact (later changed to Declaration) on Stability and Security for Moldova. Tkaciuk noted that back in 2004, when the U.S., EU, Ukraine and even Romania had agreed to this declaration, the Russian Federation had rejected it. The Moldovan side told the Russians that they would consider the idea and would need to consult with partners (the U.S., EU, Ukraine) about developments to date.

¶17. (C) Tkaciuk said that Moldova wanted U.S. support for the language on neutrality that the Moldovans and Russians had worked out (para. 13). Additionally, he asked for U.S. reaction to the idea of using the 2004 declaration as the basis for discussion for a general 5+2 agreement. The declaration would have to be updated, Tkaciuk noted. For example, the language on neutrality would be incorporated into a declaration-like document and wording about Moldovan federation would have to be removed.

¶18. (C) Action request: Post requests Washington's reaction to the language on neutrality in para. 13 and thoughts about using the 2004 declaration as the basis for a 5+2 general agreement.

Comment  
-----

¶19. (C) Tkaciuk's optimism was tempered by caution. As he noted, the Moldovans have been riding the ups and downs of the Transnistria conflict for many years. Still, we share his measured optimism and believe that the Moldovan-Russian willingness to agree to neutrality language represents a modest advance.

¶10. (C) We note problematic language in the neutrality document. The agreed-to language avoids the word "guarantee" but burdens states

CHISINAU 00000107 002 OF 002

with assuming the responsibility to respect Moldova's permanent neutrality and not to allow the use of weapons, threat of force and pressures against Moldova's sovereignty and neutral status. Instead, the U.S. could pledge to support, in so far as we are able, a future Moldovan request for assistance in the event of the threat of force or economic or other pressures against Moldovan sovereignty and neutrality. The final sentence in the Moldovan-Russian neutrality document about the UN Security Council may provide us a way around this language; we could ask the Moldovans and Russians to accept language that would have the international community in general and the UN in particular address any threats to Moldovan neutrality and sovereignty.

¶11. (C) The use of the word "permanent" to describe Moldova's neutrality is also problematic. It may be possible to qualify such language by noting that the U.S. will support/respect any Moldovan decision about its neutrality.

¶12. (C) A positive element in the neutrality document is the use of the word "recognize" in paragraph two, instead of having the U.S. guarantee Moldova's neutrality. End Comment.

Neutrality Document Agreed to by Moldova and Russia  
-----

¶13. Post's informal translation follows. Perhaps the Department's professional translators can improve our quick translation.

(Begin text) Consistent with its constitutional status of permanent neutrality, the Republic of Moldova will not permit the stationing of armed forces and military installations of other states on its territory, and consistent with supporting its non-aligned status, will not apply to join any military or military-political international or regional organization and will appeal to the UN Security Council for corresponding support in the international recognition of said status.

The Russian Federation, U.S., Ukraine, European Union and OSCE recognize such a realization of constitutional status on permanent

neutrality of the Republic of Moldova as a reliable condition for peaceful settlement of the Transnistria conflict, the re-establishment of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova within internationally recognized borders, and the basis for further enhancing the stability and security of a unified Moldovan state.

With this the Russian Federation, U.S., Ukraine and the states of the European Union commit themselves to respecting the permanent neutrality of the Republic of Moldova, and not to permit use of armed force against it, threats of force, economic and other pressures that would diminish its sovereignty, territorial integrity and neutral status. In the event such measures of pressure, aggression or threats of aggression should take place in connection with the Republic of Moldova, Moldova will appeal to the UN Security Council to provide its security. (End text)

KEIDERLING